arXiv:quant-ph/0211051v1 9 Nov 2002

Lewenstein-Sanpera decomposition of a generic 2×2 density matrix by using Wootters's basis

S. J. Akhtarshenas[a,b,c] *, M. A. Jafarizadeh[a,b,c] †

[a]Department of Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics, Tabriz University, Tabriz 51664, Iran.

[b]Institute for Studies in Theoretical Physics and Mathematics, Tehran 19395-1795, Iran.

[c]Research Institute for Fundamental Sciences, Tabriz 51664, Iran.

February 9, 2008

*E-mail:akhtarshenas@tabrizu.ac.ir

†E-mail:jafarizadeh@tabrizu.ac.ir

Abstract

The Lewenstein-Sanpera decomposition for a generic two-qubit density matrix is obtained by using Wootters's basis. It is shown that the average concurrence of the decomposition is equal to the concurrence of the state. It is also shown that all the entanglement content of the state is concentrated in the Wootters's state $|x_1\rangle$ associated with the largest eigenvalue λ_1 of the Hermitian matrix $\sqrt{\sqrt{\rho}\tilde{\rho}\sqrt{\rho}}$. It is shown that a given density matrix ρ with corresponding set of positive numbers λ_i and Wootters's basis can transforms under $SO(4,c)$ into a generic 2×2 matrix with the same set of positive numbers but with new Wootters's basis, where the local unitary transformations correspond to $SO(4,r)$ transformations, hence, ρ can be represented as coset space $SO(4,c)/SO(4,r)$ together with positive numbers λ_i. By giving an explicit parameterization we characterize a generic orbit of group of local unitary transformations.

Keywords: Quantum entanglement, Concurrence , Lewenstein-Sanpera decomposition, Two qubit systems, Wootters's basis, $SO(4,c)$

PACs Index: 03.65.Ud

1 Introduction

Perhaps, quantum entanglement is the most non-classical features of quantum mechanics [1, 2] which has recently been attracted much attention although it was discovered many decades ago by Einstein and Schrödinger [1, 2]. It plays a central role in quantum information theory and provides potential resource for quantum communication and information processing [3, 4, 5]. Entanglement is usually arise from quantum correlations between separated subsystems which can not be created by local actions on each subsystems. By definition, a bipartite mixed state ρ is said to be separable if it can be expressed as

$$\rho = \sum_i w_i \, \rho_i^{(1)} \otimes \rho_i^{(2)}, \qquad w_i \geq 0, \quad \sum_i w_i = 1,$$

where $\rho_i^{(1)}$ and $\rho_i^{(2)}$ denote density matrices of subsystems 1 and 2, respectively. Otherwise the state is entangled.

The central tasks of quantum information theory is to characterize and quantify entangled states. A first attempt in characterization of entangled states has been made by Peres and Horodecki family [6, 7]. Peres showed that a necessary condition for separability of a two partite system is that its partial transposition be positive. Horodeckis have shown that this condition is sufficient for separability of composite systems only for dimensions $2 \otimes 2$ and $2 \otimes 3$.

There is also an increasing attention in quantifying entanglement, particularly for mixed states of a bipartite system, and a number of measures have been proposed [5, 8, 9, 10]. Among them the entanglement of formation has more importance, since it intends to quantify the resources needed to create a given entangled state.

An interesting description of entanglement is Lewenstein-Sanpera decomposition [11]. Lewenstein and Sanpera in [11] showed that any two partite density matrix can be represented optimally

as a sum of a separable state and an entangled state. They have also shown that for two qubit systems the decomposition reduces to a mixture of a mixed separable state and an entangled pure state, thus all non-separability content of the state is concentrated in the pure entangled state. This leads to an unambiguous measure of entanglement for any two qubit state as entanglement of pure state multiplied by the weight of pure part in the decomposition.

The numerical method for finding the BSA has been reported in Ref. [11]. Also in two qubit systems some analytical results for special states were found in [12]. An attempt to generalize the results of Ref. [11] is made in [13]. In [14] an algebraic approach to find BSA of a two qubit state is attempted. They have also shown that the weight of the entangled part in the decomposition is equal to the concurrence of the state. In [15] we have obtained an analytical expression for L-S decomposition of Bell decomposable (BD) states. We have also obtained the optimal decomposition for a class of states obtained from BD states via some LQCC actions.

Wootters in [10] has shown that for any two qubit density matrix ρ there always exist a decomposition $\rho = \sum_i |x_i\rangle \langle x_i|$ such that $\langle x_i|\tilde{x}_j\rangle = \lambda_i \delta_{ij}$, where λ_i are square roots of eigenvalues, in decreasing order, of the non-Hermitian matrix $\rho\tilde{\rho}$. Based on this the concurrence of the mixed state ρ is defined by $\max(0, \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4)$ [10].

In this paper, by using Wootters's basis, we give an analytical expression for optimal Lewenstein-Sanpera decomposition for any two qubit density matrix. We show that all entanglement content of the state is concentrated in the Wootters's state $|x_1\rangle$ associated with the largest eigenvalue λ_1. It is also shown that the average concurrence of the decomposition is equal to the concurrence of the state.

It is shown that a given density matrix ρ with corresponding set of positive numbers λ_i and Wootters's basis can transforms under $SO(4, c)$ into a generic 2×2 matrix with the same set of

positive numbers but with new Wootters's basis, where the local unitary transformations correspond to $SO(4,r)$ transformations, hence, ρ can be represented as coset space $SO(4,c)/SO(4,r)$ together with positive numbers λ_i. By giving an explicit parameterization we characterize a generic orbit of group of local unitary transformations.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we review concurrence for two qubit density matrix. In section 3 we give an analytical expression for L-S decomposition of a generic density matrix. We prove that the decomposition is optimal. Characterization of the density matrix in terms of orthogonal group is presented in section 4. Section 4 is devoted to explicit parameterization of a generic density matrix up to a local unitary transformation. The paper is ended with a brief conclusion in section 5.

2 Concurrence

In this section we first review concurrence of two qubit mixed states. From the various measures proposed to quantify entanglement, the entanglement of formation has a special position which in fact intends to quantify the resources needed to create a given entangled state [5]. In the case of pure state if the density matrix obtained from partial trace over other subsystems is not pure the state is entangled. For the pure state $|\psi\rangle$ of a bipartite system, entropy of the density matrix associated with either of the the two subsystems is a good measure of entanglement

$$E(\psi) = -Tr(\rho_A \log_2 \rho_A) = -Tr(\rho_B \log_2 \rho_B),$$

where $\rho_A = Tr_B(|\psi\rangle \langle\psi|)$ and ρ_B defined similarly. Due to classical correlations where exist in the mixed state each subsystem can have non-zero entropy even if there is no entanglement, therefore von Neumann entropy of a subsystem is no longer a good measure of entanglement. For a mixed

state entanglement of formation is defined as the minimum of average entropy of the state over all pure state decompositions of the state

$$E_f(\rho) = \min \sum_i p_i E(\psi_i). \tag{2-1}$$

Wootters in [10] has shown that for a two qubit system entanglement of formation of a mixed state ρ can be defined as

$$E_f(\rho) = H\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{1 - C^2}\right), \tag{2-2}$$

where $H(x) = -x \ln x - (1-x) \ln (1-x)$ is binary entropy and concurrence $C(\rho)$ is defined by

$$C(\rho) = \max\{0, \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4\}, \tag{2-3}$$

where the λ_i are the non-negative eigenvalues, in decreasing order, of the Hermitian matrix $R \equiv \sqrt{\sqrt{\rho}\tilde{\rho}\sqrt{\rho}}$ and

$$\tilde{\rho} = (\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y)\rho^*(\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y), \tag{2-4}$$

where ρ^* is the complex conjugate of ρ when it is expressed in a standard basis such as $\{|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle, |\uparrow\downarrow\rangle\}, \{|\downarrow\uparrow\rangle, |\downarrow\downarrow\rangle\}$ and σ_y represent Pauli matrix in local basis $\{|\uparrow\rangle, |\downarrow\rangle\}$.

Consider a generic two qubit density matrix ρ with its subnormalized orthogonal eigenvectors $|v_i\rangle$, i.e. $\rho = \sum_i |v_i\rangle \langle v_i|$. There always exist a decomposition [10]

$$\rho = \sum_i |x_i\rangle \langle x_i| \tag{2-5}$$

where Wootters states $|x_i\rangle$ are defined by

$$|x_i\rangle = \sum_j^4 U_{ij}^* |v_i\rangle, \qquad \text{for} \quad i = 1, 2, 3, 4, \tag{2-6}$$

such that

$$\langle x_i \mid \tilde{x}_j\rangle = (U\tau U^T)_{ij} = \lambda_i \delta_{ij}, \tag{2-7}$$

where $\tau_{ij} = \langle v_i \mid \tilde{v}_j \rangle$ is a symmetric but not necessarily Hermitian matrix. To construct $|x_i\rangle$ we use the fact that for any symmetric matrix τ one can always find a unitary matrix U in such a way that λ_i are real and non-negative, that is, they are the square roots of eigenvalues of $\tau\tau^*$ which are the same as eigenvalues of R. Alternatively one can always find U such that λ_i appear in decreasing order.

3 Lewenstein-Sanpera decomposition

According to Lewenstein-Sanpera decomposition [11], any two qubit density matrix ρ can be written as

$$\rho = \lambda \rho_{sep} + (1-\lambda) \left|\psi\right\rangle \left\langle\psi\right|, \qquad \lambda \in [0,1], \tag{3-8}$$

where ρ_{sep} is a separable density matrix and $|\psi\rangle$ is a pure entangled state. The Lewenstein-Sanpera decomposition of a given density matrix ρ is not unique and, in general, there is a continuum set of L-S decomposition to choose from. The optimal decomposition is, however, unique for which λ is maximal, and

$$\rho = \lambda^{(opt)} \rho_{sep}^{(opt)} + (1-\lambda^{(opt)}) |\psi^{(opt)}\rangle\langle\psi^{(opt)}|, \qquad \lambda^{(opt)} \in [0,1]. \tag{3-9}$$

In Ref. [11] Lewenstein and Sanpera have shown that any other decomposition of the form $\rho = \tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\rho}_{sep} + (1-\tilde{\lambda})|\tilde{\psi}\rangle\langle\tilde{\psi}|$, with $\tilde{\lambda} \in [0,1]$ such that $\tilde{\rho} \neq \rho^{(opt)}$ necessarily implies that $\tilde{\lambda} < \lambda^{(opt)}$ [11].

Here in this section we obtain L-S decomposition for a generic two qubit density matrix by using Wootters states. First we define states $|x_i'\rangle$ in terms of Wootters states as

$$|x_i'\rangle = \frac{|x_i\rangle}{\sqrt{\lambda_i}}, \qquad \text{for } i = 1,2,3,4. \tag{3-10}$$

Thus the decomposition given in Eq. (2-5) becomes

$$\rho = \sum_i \lambda_i \left|x_i'\right\rangle \left\langle x_i'\right| , \tag{3-11}$$

where can be rewritten in the following form

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^4 \lambda_i \left|x_i'\right\rangle \left\langle x_i'\right| \\ &= (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4) \left|x_1'\right\rangle \left\langle x_1'\right| + (\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4) \left|x_1'\right\rangle \left\langle x_1'\right| + \textstyle\sum_{j=2}^4 \lambda_j \left|x_j'\right\rangle \left\langle x_j'\right| \\ &= (1-\lambda) \left|\psi\right\rangle \left\langle \psi\right| + \lambda\, \rho_{sep} , \end{aligned} \tag{3-12}$$

where separable density matrix ρ_{sep} and entangled pure state $|\psi\rangle$ are given by

$$\rho_{sep} = \left(\frac{\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4}{\lambda \lambda_1} \right) \left|x_1\right\rangle \left\langle x_1\right| + \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{j=2}^{4} \left|x_j\right\rangle \left\langle x_j\right| , \tag{3-13}$$

and

$$\left|\psi\right\rangle = \frac{\left|x_1\right\rangle}{\sqrt{\left\langle x_1 | x_1\right\rangle}}, \tag{3-14}$$

respectively, and parameter λ is equal to

$$\lambda = 1 - \left(\frac{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4}{\lambda_1} \right) \left\langle x_1 | x_1 \right\rangle . \tag{3-15}$$

Equation (3-14) shows that all entanglement content of the state is concentrated in the Wootters state $|x_1\rangle$ associated to the largest eigenvalues λ_1. It is also worth to note that average concurrence of the decomposition is

$$(1-\lambda) \left\langle \psi | \tilde{\psi} \right\rangle = (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4), \tag{3-16}$$

that is, it is equal to the concurrence of the state.

In order to show that the decomposition given in (3-12) is optimal we first show that ρ_{sep} can be represented as a convex sum of product states. First note that ρ_{sep} can be written as

$$\rho_{sep} = \sum_{i=1}^{4} \left|x_i''\right\rangle \left\langle x_i''\right| , \tag{3-17}$$

where $|x_i''\rangle$ are defined by

$$|x_1''\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_2+\lambda_3+\lambda_4}{\lambda\,\lambda_1}}\,|x_1\rangle\,, \qquad \left|x_j''\right\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}\,|x_j\rangle\,, \quad \text{for } j=2,3,4. \tag{3-18}$$

Obviously, the basis $\left|x_j''\right\rangle$ $(i=1,2,3,4)$ satisfy the following relations

$$\left\langle x_i''|\tilde{x_j''}\right\rangle = \lambda_i''\delta_{ij},$$

where $\left|\tilde{x_j''}\right\rangle$ $(j=1,2,3,4)$ are corresponding dual basis.

Wootters in [10] has shown that any two qubit separable density matrix with decomposition given in Eq. (3-17) can be expanded in terms of following product states

$$|z_1\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\left(e^{i\theta_1}\,|x_1''\rangle + e^{i\theta_2}\,|x_2''\rangle + e^{i\theta_3}\,|x_3''\rangle + e^{i\theta_4}\,|x_4''\rangle\right), \tag{3-19}$$

$$|z_2\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\left(e^{i\theta_1}\,|x_1''\rangle + e^{i\theta_2}\,|x_2''\rangle - e^{i\theta_3}\,|x_3''\rangle - e^{i\theta_4}\,|x_4''\rangle\right), \tag{3-20}$$

$$|z_3\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\left(e^{i\theta_1}\,|x_1''\rangle - e^{i\theta_2}\,|x_2''\rangle + e^{i\theta_3}\,|x_3''\rangle - e^{i\theta_4}\,|x_4''\rangle\right), \tag{3-21}$$

$$|z_4\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\left(e^{i\theta_1}\,|x_1''\rangle - e^{i\theta_2}\,|x_2''\rangle - e^{i\theta_3}\,|x_3''\rangle + e^{i\theta_4}\,|x_4''\rangle\right), \tag{3-22}$$

where zero concurrence is guaranteed with $\sum_{j=1} e^{2i\theta_j}\lambda_j'' = 0$.

Now using the fact that the eigenvalues λ_i'' of boundary separable states ρ_{sep} satisfy constraint $\lambda_1'' - \lambda_2'' - \lambda_3'' - \lambda_4'' = 0$, we can choose phase factors θ_i as $\theta_2 = \theta_3 = \theta_4 = \theta_1 + \pi$. Choosing $\theta_1 = 0$ we arrive at the following product ensemble for ρ_{sep}

$$|z_1\rangle = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\lambda}}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\lambda_2+\lambda_3+\lambda_4}{\lambda_1}}\,|x_1\rangle - i\,|x_2\rangle - i\,|x_3\rangle - i\,|x_4\rangle\right), \tag{3-23}$$

$$|z_2\rangle = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\lambda}}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\lambda_2+\lambda_3+\lambda_4}{\lambda_1}}\,|x_1\rangle - i\,|x_2\rangle + i\,|x_3\rangle + i\,|x_4\rangle\right), \tag{3-24}$$

$$|z_3\rangle = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\lambda}}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\lambda_2+\lambda_3+\lambda_4}{\lambda_1}}\,|x_1\rangle + i\,|x_2\rangle - i\,|x_3\rangle + i\,|x_4\rangle\right), \tag{3-25}$$

$$|z_4\rangle = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\lambda}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4}{\lambda_1}} |x_1\rangle + i |x_2\rangle + i |x_3\rangle - i |x_4\rangle \right). \tag{3-26}$$

It can be easily seen that all $|z_i\rangle$ have zero concurrence and also ρ_{sep} can be expanded as

$$\rho_{sep} = \sum_{i=1}^{4} |z_i\rangle \langle z_i| . \tag{3-27}$$

In the rest of this section we will prove that the decomposition (3-12) is the optimal one. To do so we have to find a decomposition for ρ_{sep} in terms of product states $|e_\alpha, f_\alpha\rangle$, i.e.

$$\rho_{sep} = \sum_{\alpha} \Lambda_\alpha |e_\alpha, f_\alpha\rangle \langle e_\alpha, f_\alpha| \tag{3-28}$$

such that the following conditions are satisfied [11]

i) All Λ_α are maximal with respect to $\rho_\alpha = \Lambda_\alpha |e_\alpha, f_\alpha\rangle \langle e_\alpha, f_\alpha| + (1-\lambda) |\psi\rangle \langle\psi|$ and projector $P_\alpha = |e_\alpha, f_\alpha\rangle \langle e_\alpha, f_\alpha|$.

ii) All pairs $(\Lambda_\alpha, \Lambda_\beta)$ are maximal with respect to $\rho_{\alpha\beta} = \Lambda_\alpha |e_\alpha, f_\alpha\rangle \langle e_\alpha, f_\alpha| + \Lambda_\beta |e_\beta, f_\beta\rangle \langle e_\beta, f_\beta| + (1-\lambda) |\psi\rangle \langle\psi|$ and the pairs of projector (P_α, P_β).

Then according to [11] ρ_{sep} is BSA and the decomposition given in Eq. (3-12) is optimal.

Lewenstein and Sanpera in [11] have shown that Λ_α is maximal with respect to ρ_α and $P_\alpha = |e_\alpha, f_\alpha\rangle \langle\psi|$ iff

a) if $|e_\alpha, f_\alpha\rangle \notin \mathcal{R}(\rho_\alpha)$ then $\Lambda_\alpha = 0$, and b) if $|e_\alpha, f_\alpha\rangle \in \mathcal{R}(\rho_\alpha)$ then $\Lambda_\alpha = \langle e_\alpha, f_\alpha| \rho_\alpha^{-1} |e_\alpha, f_\alpha\rangle^{-1} > 0$. They have also shown that a pair (Λ_1, Λ_2) is maximal with respect to ρ_{12} and a pair of projectors (P_1, P_2) iff:

a) if $|e_1, f_1\rangle$, $|e_2, f_2\rangle$ do not belong to $\mathcal{R}(\rho_{12})$ then $\Lambda_1 = \Lambda_2 = 0$; b) if $|e_1, f_1\rangle$ does not belong, while $|e_2, f_2\rangle \in \mathcal{R}(\rho_{12})$ then $\Lambda_1 = 0$, $\Lambda_2 = \langle e_2, f_2| \rho_{12}^{-1} |e_2, f_2\rangle^{-1}$; c) if $|e_1, f_1\rangle$, $|e_2, f_2\rangle \in \mathcal{R}(\rho_{12})$ and $\langle e_1, f_1| \rho_{12}^{-1} |e_2, f_2\rangle = 0$ then $\Lambda_i = \langle e_i, f_i| \rho_{12}^{-1} |e_i, f_i\rangle^{-1}$, $i = 1, 2$; d) finally, if $|e_1, f_1\rangle, |e_2, f_2\rangle \in \mathcal{R}(\rho_{12})$ and $\langle e_1, f_1| \rho_{12}^{-1} |e_2, f_2\rangle \neq 0$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_1 = & \quad (\langle e_2, f_2| \rho_{12}^{-1} |e_2, f_2\rangle - |\langle e_1, f_1| \rho_{12}^{-1} |e_2, f_2\rangle|)/D, \\ \Lambda_2 = & \quad (\langle e_1, f_1| \rho_{12}^{-1} |e_1, f_1\rangle - |\langle e_1, f_1| \rho_{12}^{-1} |e_2, f_2\rangle|)/D, \end{aligned} \tag{3-29}$$

where $D = \langle e_1, f_1| \rho_{12}^{-1} |e_1, f_1\rangle \langle e_2, f_2| \rho_{12}^{-1} |e_2, f_2\rangle - |\langle e_1, f_1| \rho_{-1} |e_2, f_2\rangle|^2$.

Now we return to show that the decomposition given in (3-12) is optimal. We first consider the cases that ρ has full rank. Let us consider the set of four product vectors $\{|z_i\rangle\}$ and one entangled state $|x_1\rangle$. In Ref. [10] it is shown that the ensemble $\{|z_i\rangle\}$ are linearly independent, also it is straightforward to see that three vectors $|z_\alpha\rangle$, $|z_\beta\rangle$ and $|x_1\rangle$ are linearly independent. Now let us consider matrices $\rho_\alpha = \Lambda_\alpha |z_\alpha\rangle \langle z_\alpha| + (1-\lambda) |x_1\rangle \langle x_1|$. Due to independency of $|z_\alpha\rangle$ and $|x_1\rangle$ we can deduce that the range of ρ_α is two dimensional, thus after restriction to its range and defining dual basis $|\hat{z}_\alpha\rangle$ and $|\hat{x}_1\rangle$ we can expand restricted inverse ρ_α^{-1} as $\rho_\alpha^{-1} = \Lambda_\alpha^{-1}|\hat{z}_\alpha\rangle\langle \hat{z}_\alpha| + (1-\lambda)^{-1}|\hat{x}_1\rangle\langle \hat{x}_1|$ (see appendix). Using Eq. (5-59) it is easy to see that $\langle z_\alpha|\rho_\alpha^{-1}|z_\alpha\rangle = \Lambda_\alpha^{-1}$. This shows that Λ_α are maximal with respect to ρ_α and the projector $P_\alpha = |z_\alpha\rangle \langle z_\alpha|$.

Similarly considering matrices $\rho_{\alpha\beta} = \Lambda_\alpha |z_\alpha\rangle \langle z_\alpha| + \Lambda_\beta |z_\beta\rangle \langle z_\beta| + (1-\lambda) |x_1\rangle \langle x_1|$ and considering the independency of vectors $|z_\alpha\rangle$, $|z_\beta\rangle$ and $|x_1\rangle$ we see that the rang of $\rho_{\alpha\beta}$ is three dimensional where after restriction to its range and defining their dual basis $|\hat{z}_\alpha\rangle$, $|\hat{z}_\beta\rangle$ and $|\hat{x}_1\rangle$ we can write restricted inverse $\rho_{\alpha\beta}^{-1}$ as $\rho_{\alpha\beta}^{-1} = \Lambda_\alpha^{-1}|\hat{z}_\alpha\rangle\langle \hat{z}_\alpha| + \Lambda_\beta^{-1}|\hat{z}_\beta\rangle\langle \hat{z}_\beta| + (1-\lambda)^{-1}|\hat{x}_1\rangle\langle \hat{x}_1|$. Then it is straightforward to get $\langle z_\alpha| \rho_{\alpha\beta}^{-1} |z_\alpha\rangle = \Lambda_\alpha^{-1}$, $\langle z_\beta| \rho_{\alpha\beta}^{-1} |z_\beta\rangle = \Lambda_\beta^{-1}$ and $\langle z_\alpha| \rho_{\alpha\beta}^{-1} |z_\beta\rangle = 0$. This implies that the pair $(\Lambda_\alpha, \Lambda_\beta)$ are maximal with respect to $\rho_{\alpha\beta}$ and the pair of projectors (P_α, P_β), thus complete the proof that the decomposition given in Eq. (3-12) is optimal.

We now consider the cases that ρ has rank three, that is $\lambda_4 = 0$. In this case the pairs $\{|z_1\rangle, |z_4\rangle\}$ and also $\{|z_2\rangle, |z_3\rangle\}$ are no longer independent with respect to $|x_1\rangle$. In former case we can evaluate $|x_1\rangle$ in terms of $|z_1\rangle$ and $|z_4\rangle$ then matrix ρ_{14} can be written in terms of two

basis $|z_1\rangle$ and $|z_4\rangle$ which yields after some calculations, $\left\langle z_1|\rho_{14}^{-1}|z_1\right\rangle = \frac{1}{\Gamma_{14}}\left(\Lambda_4 + (1-\lambda)\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2+\lambda_3}\right)\right)$, $\left\langle z_4|\rho_{14}^{-1}|z_4\right\rangle = \frac{1}{\Gamma_{14}}\left(\Lambda_1 + (1-\lambda)\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2+\lambda_3}\right)\right)$ and $\left\langle z_1|\rho_{14}^{-1}|z_4\right\rangle = \frac{-1}{\Gamma_{14}}\left((1-\lambda)\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2+\lambda_3}\right)\right)$ where $\Gamma_{14} = \left(\Lambda_1\Lambda_4 + (\Lambda_1+\Lambda_2)(1-\lambda)\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2+\lambda_3}\right)\right)$. Using the above results together with Eqs. (3-29) we obtain the maximality of pair (Λ_1, Λ_4) with respect to ρ_{14} and the pair of projectors (P_1, P_4). Similarly in the second case one can express $|x_1\rangle$ in terms of $|z_2\rangle$ and $|z_3\rangle$ and evaluate ρ_{23}^{-1}, which get $\left\langle z_2|\rho_{23}^{-1}|z_2\right\rangle = \frac{1}{\Gamma_{23}}\left(\Lambda_3 + (1-\lambda)\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2+\lambda_3}\right)\right)$, $\left\langle z_3|\rho_{23}^{-1}|z_3\right\rangle = \frac{1}{\Gamma_{23}}\left(\Lambda_2 + (1-\lambda)\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2+\lambda_3}\right)\right)$ and $\left\langle z_2|\rho_{23}^{-1}|z_3\right\rangle = \frac{-1}{\Gamma_{23}}\left((1-\lambda)\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2+\lambda_3}\right)\right)$ with $\Gamma_{23} = \left(\Lambda_2\Lambda_3 + (\Lambda_2+\Lambda_3)(1-\lambda)\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2+\lambda_3}\right)\right)$, together with Eqs. (3-29) we obtain the maximality of pair (Λ_2, Λ_3) with respect to ρ_{23} and the pair of projectors (P_2, P_3). For other choices of α and β three vectors $|z_\alpha\rangle$,$|z_\beta\rangle$ and $|x_1\rangle$ remain linearly independent thus we can prove maximality of pairs $(\Lambda_\alpha, \Lambda_\beta)$ in the same way that we proved it in full rank case.

Finally let us consider cases that ρ has rank two, that is $\lambda_3 = \lambda_4 = 0$. In this case we have $|z_1\rangle = |z_2\rangle$ and $|z_3\rangle = |z_4\rangle$. It is now sufficient to take $|z_1\rangle$ and $|z_3\rangle$ as product ensemble. But in this case vectors $|z_1\rangle$ and $|z_3\rangle$ are not independent with respect to $|x_1\rangle$. We express $|x_1\rangle$ in terms of $|z_1\rangle$ and $|z_3\rangle$ then matrix ρ_{13} can be written in terms of two vectors $|z_1\rangle$ and $|z_3\rangle$ and after some calculations we get $\left\langle z_1|\rho_{13}^{-1}|z_1\right\rangle = \frac{1}{\Gamma_{13}}\left(\Lambda_3 + (1-\lambda)\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}\right)\right)$, $\left\langle z_3|\rho_{13}^{-1}|z_3\right\rangle = \frac{1}{\Gamma_{13}}\left(\Lambda_1 + (1-\lambda)\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}\right)\right)$ and $\left\langle z_1|\rho_{13}^{-1}|z_3\right\rangle = \frac{-1}{\Gamma_{13}}\left((1-\lambda)\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}\right)\right)$ where $\Gamma_{13} = \left(\Lambda_1\Lambda_3 + (\Lambda_1+\Lambda_3)(1-\lambda)\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}\right)\right)$. Using the above results together with Eqs. (3-29) we obtain the maximality of pairs (Λ_1, Λ_3) with respect to ρ_{13} and the pairs of projectors (P_1, P_3).

4 Coset structure for a generic 2×2 density matrix in Wootters's basis

In this section we obtain an explicit parameterization for a generic two qubit density matrix in Wootters's basis. To this aim for any density matrix ρ with decomposition given in Eq. (3-11) we define matrix X as

$$X = \left(\left|x_1'\right\rangle, \left|x_2'\right\rangle, \left|x_3'\right\rangle, \left|x_4'\right\rangle\right). \tag{4-30}$$

Analogously by defining matrix

$$\widetilde{X} = \left(\left|\widetilde{x'}_1\right\rangle, \left|\widetilde{x'}_2\right\rangle, \left|\widetilde{x'}_3\right\rangle, \left|\widetilde{x'}_4\right\rangle\right), \tag{4-31}$$

Eq. (2-7) takes the following form

$$\widetilde{X}^{\dagger} X = X^T \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y X = I. \tag{4-32}$$

Since matrix $\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y$ is symmetric it can be diagonalized as

$$\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y = O^T \eta^2 O, \tag{4-33}$$

where O is an orthogonal matrix defined by

$$O = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4-34}$$

and η is the diagonal matrix

$$\eta = \begin{pmatrix} i & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & i & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4-35}$$

Using Eq. (4-33) we can rewrite Eq. (4-32) as

$$Y^T Y = I, \tag{4-36}$$

where

$$Y = \eta\, O X. \tag{4-37}$$

Equation (4-36) shows that Y is a complex 4-dimensional orthogonal matrix. This means that a given density matrix ρ with corresponding set of positive numbers λ_i and Wootters's basis can transforms under $SO(4, c)$ into a generic 2×2 density matrix with the same set of positive numbers but with new Wootters's basis. This implies that the space of two qubit density matrices can be characterize with 12-dimensional (as real manifold) space of complex orthogonal group $SO(4, c)$ together with four positive numbers λ_i. Of course the normalization condition reduces number of parameters to 15.

As far as entanglement is concerned the states ρ and ρ' are equivalent if they are on the same orbit of the group of local transformation, that is, if there exist local unitary transformation $U_1 \otimes U_2$ such that $\rho' = (U_1 \otimes U_2)\rho(U_1 \otimes U_2)^\dagger$, where U_1 and U_2 are unitary transformations acting on Hilbert spaces of particles A and B, respectively.

It can be easily seen that under above mentioned local unitary transformations of density matrix

ρ, the matrix X transforms as

$$X \to X' = (U_1 \otimes U_2)X. \tag{4-38}$$

It is worth to mention that X' also satisfy Eq. (4-32). To show that this is indeed the case, we need to note that $X'^T \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y X' = X^T (U_1^T \sigma_y U_1) \otimes (U_2^T \sigma_y U_2) X$. By using $(\sigma_y)_{ij} = -i\epsilon_{ij}$ we get $(U^T \sigma_y U)_{ij} = -i\epsilon_{kl} U_{ki} U_{lj} = -i \det(U) \epsilon_{ij} = \sigma_y$, where the fact that $U_i \in SU(2)$, thus having unit determinant, have been used. This implies that

$$X'^T \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y X' = I. \tag{4-39}$$

By defining Y' as

$$Y' = \eta\, O X', \tag{4-40}$$

one can easily show that Y' is also satisfied orthogonality condition

$$Y'^T Y' = I. \tag{4-41}$$

Now by using Eq. (4-40) and inverting Eq. (4-38), we can express Y' in terms of Y

$$Y' = (\eta\, O)(U_1 \otimes U_2)(\eta\, O)^{-1} Y. \tag{4-42}$$

Now by using the fact that $(\eta\, O) \exp(\mathcal{U}_1 \otimes \mathcal{U}_2)(\eta\, O)^{-1} = \exp((\eta\, O)(\mathcal{U}_1 \otimes \mathcal{U}_2)(\eta\, O)^{-1})$ and using the explicit form for generators $(\mathcal{U}_1 \otimes \mathcal{U}_2)$ of local group, one can after some algebraic calculations see that $(\eta\, O)(\mathcal{U}_1 \otimes \mathcal{U}_2)(\eta\, O)^{-1}$ is real antisymmetric matrix. This means that under local unitary transformations matrix Y transforms with $SO(4, r)$ group. So we can parameterize the space of two qubit density matrices as 6-dimensional coset space $SO(4, c)/SO(4, r)$ together with 4 positive numbers λ_i, which again normailzation condition reduces the number of parameters to 9.

In the following we will obtain an explicit parameterization for a generic two qubit density matrix. First note that we can decompose coset $SO(4,c)/SO(4,r)$ as [16]

$$\frac{SO(4,c)}{SO(4,r)} = \frac{SO(4,c)/SO(4,r)}{SO(2,c)/SO(2,r) \otimes SO(2,c)/SO(2,r)} \bigotimes \left(\frac{SO(2,c)}{SO(2,r)} \otimes \frac{SO(2,c)}{SO(2,r)} \right), \tag{4-43}$$

that is, coset representative Y can be decomposed as $Y = Y_1 Y_2$. One can easily show that coset representative of $SO(2,c)/SO(2,r)$ has the following form

$$\exp \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i\phi \\ -i\phi & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cosh\phi & i\sinh\phi \\ -i\sinh\phi & \cosh\phi \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4-44}$$

Thus Y_2 can be written as

$$Y_2 = \left(\begin{array}{cc|cc} \cosh\phi_1 & i\sinh\phi_1 & \multicolumn{2}{c}{0} \\ -i\sinh\phi_1 & \cosh\phi_1 & & \\ \hline \multicolumn{2}{c|}{0} & \cosh\phi_2 & i\sinh\phi_2 \\ & & -i\sinh\phi_2 & \cosh\phi_2 \end{array} \right). \tag{4-45}$$

On the other hand Y_1 can be evaluated as

$$Y_1 = \exp \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & iB \\ \hline -iB^T & 0 \end{array} \right) = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \cosh\sqrt{BB^T} & iB\frac{\sinh\sqrt{B^TB}}{\sqrt{B^TB}} \\ \hline -i\frac{\sinh\sqrt{B^TB}}{\sqrt{B^TB}}B^T & \cosh\sqrt{B^TB} \end{array} \right) = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \sqrt{I+CC^T} & iC \\ \hline -iC^T & \sqrt{I+C^TC} \end{array} \right), \tag{4-46}$$

where B is a 2×2 matrix and in the last step we used $C = B\frac{\sinh\sqrt{B^TB}}{\sqrt{B^TB}}$. Now using the singular value decomposition $C = O_1 D O_2^T$, Eq. (4-46) becomes

$$Y_1 = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} O_1\sqrt{I+D^2}O_1^T & iO_1DO_2^T \\ \hline -iO_2DO_1^T & O_2\sqrt{I+D^2}O_2^T \end{array} \right), \tag{4-47}$$

where D is a non-negative diagonal matrix. It can be easily seen that Eq. (4-47) can be decomposed

as

$$Y_1 = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} O_1 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & O_2 \end{array}\right) \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \sqrt{I+D^2} & iD \\ \hline -iD & \sqrt{I+D^2} \end{array}\right) \left(\begin{array}{c|c} O_1^T & 0 \\ \hline 0 & O_2^T \end{array}\right). \tag{4-48}$$

By combining Eqs. (4-45) and (4-48) we get

$$Y = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} O_1 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & O_2 \end{array}\right) \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \sqrt{I+D^2} & iD \\ \hline -iD & \sqrt{I+D^2} \end{array}\right) \left(\begin{array}{c|c} O_1' & 0 \\ \hline 0 & O_2' \end{array}\right). \tag{4-49}$$

Finally using parameterization given in Eq. (4-45) we get

$$Y = \left(\begin{array}{cc|cc} \cosh\theta_1 & i\sinh\theta_1 & \multicolumn{2}{c}{\multirow{2}{*}{0}} \\ -i\sinh\theta_1 & \cosh\theta_1 & & \\ \hline \multicolumn{2}{c|}{\multirow{2}{*}{0}} & \cosh\theta_2 & i\sinh\theta_2 \\ & & -i\sinh\theta_2 & \cosh\theta_2 \end{array}\right) \left(\begin{array}{cc|cc} \cosh\xi_1 & 0 & i\sinh\xi_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \cosh\xi_2 & 0 & i\sinh\xi_2 \\ \hline -i\sinh\xi_1 & 0 & \cosh\xi_1 & 0 \\ 0 & -i\sin\xi_2 & 0 & \cosh\xi_2 \end{array}\right)$$

$$\left(\begin{array}{cc|cc} \cosh\phi_1 & i\sinh\phi_1 & \multicolumn{2}{c}{\multirow{2}{*}{0}} \\ -i\sinh\phi_1 & \cosh\phi_1 & & \\ \hline \multicolumn{2}{c|}{\multirow{2}{*}{0}} & \cosh\phi_2 & i\sinh\phi_2 \\ & & -i\sinh\phi_2 & \cosh\phi_2 \end{array}\right), \tag{4-50}$$

where $\sinh\xi_i$ (for $i = 1, 2$) are diagonal elements of D with the conditions $\xi_i \geq 0$.

Using above results and Eq. (4-30) and (4-37) we can evaluate the states $|x_i\rangle$ as

$$|x_1\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_1}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} -(\sinh\xi_1\sinh\theta_2\cosh\phi_1 + \sinh\xi_2\cosh\theta_2\sinh\phi_1) - i(\cosh\xi_1\cosh\theta_1\cosh\phi_1 + \cosh\xi_2\sinh\theta_1\sinh\phi_1) \\ -(\sinh\xi_1\cosh\theta_2\cosh\phi_1 + \sinh\xi_2\sinh\theta_2\sinh\phi_1) - i(\cosh\xi_1\sinh\theta_1\cosh\phi_1 + \cosh\xi_2\cosh\theta_1\sinh\phi_1) \\ (\sinh\xi_1\cosh\theta_2\cosh\phi_1 + \sinh\xi_2\sinh\theta_2\sinh\phi_1) - i(\cosh\xi_1\sinh\theta_1\cosh\phi_1 + \cosh\xi_2\cosh\theta_1\sinh\phi_1) \\ (\sinh\xi_1\sinh\theta_2\cosh\phi_1 + \sinh\xi_2\cosh\theta_2\sinh\phi_1) - i(\cosh\xi_1\cosh\theta_1\cosh\phi_1 + \cosh\xi_2\sinh\theta_1\sinh\phi_1) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4-51}$$

$$|x_2\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_2}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} (\cosh\xi_1 \cosh\theta_1 \sinh\phi_1 + \cosh\xi_2 \sinh\theta_1 \cosh\phi_1) - i(\sinh\xi_1 \sinh\theta_2 \sinh\phi_1 + \sinh\xi_2 \cosh\theta_2 \cosh\phi_1) \\ (\cosh\xi_1 \sinh\theta_1 \sinh\phi_1 + \cosh\xi_2 \cosh\theta_1 \cosh\phi_1) - i(\sinh\xi_1 \cosh\theta_2 \sinh\phi_1 + \sinh\xi_2 \sinh\theta_2 \cosh\phi_1) \\ (\cosh\xi_1 \sinh\theta_1 \sinh\phi_1 + \cosh\xi_2 \cosh\theta_1 \cosh\phi_1) + i(\sinh\xi_1 \cosh\theta_2 \sinh\phi_1 + \sinh\xi_2 \sinh\theta_2 \cosh\phi_1) \\ (\cosh\xi_1 \cosh\theta_1 \sinh\phi_1 + \cosh\xi_2 \sinh\theta_1 \cosh\phi_1) + i(\sinh\xi_1 \sinh\theta_2 \sinh\phi_1 + \sinh\xi_2 \cosh\theta_2 \cosh\phi_1) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4-52}$$

$$|x_3\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_3}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} (\sinh\xi_1 \cosh\theta_1 \cosh\phi_2 + \sinh\xi_2 \sinh\theta_1 \sinh\phi_2) - i(\cosh\xi_1 \sinh\theta_2 \cosh\phi_2 + \cosh\xi_2 \cosh\theta_2 \sinh\phi_2) \\ (\sinh\xi_1 \sinh\theta_1 \cosh\phi_2 + \sinh\xi_2 \cosh\theta_1 \sinh\phi_2) - i(\cosh\xi_1 \cosh\theta_2 \cosh\phi_2 + \cosh\xi_2 \sinh\theta_2 \sinh\phi_2) \\ (\sinh\xi_1 \sinh\theta_1 \cosh\phi_2 + \sinh\xi_2 \cosh\theta_1 \sinh\phi_2) + i(\cosh\xi_1 \cosh\theta_2 \cosh\phi_2 + \cosh\xi_2 \sinh\theta_2 \sinh\phi_2) \\ (\sinh\xi_1 \cosh\theta_1 \cosh\phi_2 + \sinh\xi_2 \sinh\theta_1 \sinh\phi_2) + i(\cosh\xi_1 \sinh\theta_2 \cosh\phi_2 + \cosh\xi_2 \cosh\theta_2 \sinh\phi_2) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4-53}$$

$$|x_4\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_4}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} (\cosh\xi_1 \sinh\theta_2 \sinh\phi_2 + \cosh\xi_2 \cosh\theta_2 \cosh\phi_2) + i(\sinh\xi_1 \cosh\theta_1 \sinh\phi_2 + \sinh\xi_2 \sinh\theta_1 \cosh\phi_2) \\ (\cosh\xi_1 \cosh\theta_2 \sinh\phi_2 + \cosh\xi_2 \sinh\theta_2 \cosh\phi_2) + i(\sinh\xi_1 \sinh\theta_1 \sinh\phi_2 + \sinh\xi_2 \cosh\theta_1 \cosh\phi_2) \\ -(\cosh\xi_1 \cosh\theta_2 \sinh\phi_2 + \cosh\xi_2 \sinh\theta_2 \cosh\phi_2) + i(\sinh\xi_1 \sinh\theta_1 \sinh\phi_2 + \sinh\xi_2 \cosh\theta_1 \cosh\phi_2) \\ -(\cosh\xi_1 \sinh\theta_2 \sinh\phi_2 + \cosh\xi_2 \cosh\theta_2 \cosh\phi_2) + i(\sinh\xi_1 \cosh\theta_1 \sinh\phi_2 + \sinh\xi_2 \sinh\theta_1 \cosh\phi_2) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4-54}$$

Equations (4-51) to (4-54) together with normalization condition $\sum_{i=1}^{4} \langle x_i | x_i \rangle = 1$ give a parameterization for a generic orbit of two qubit density matrix up to local unitary group. As an example let us consider Bell decomposable states $\rho = \sum_{i=1}^{4} p_i \, |\psi_i\rangle \langle\psi_i|$, where $p_i \geq 0$, $\sum_i p_i = 1$. For these states by choosing $\theta_1 = \theta_2 = \xi_1 = \xi_2 = \phi_1 = \phi_2 = 0$ we get $\lambda_i = p_i$ and states $|x_i\rangle$ are given by

$$|x_1\rangle = -i\sqrt{p_1}\,|\psi_1\rangle\,, \qquad |\psi_1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle + |\downarrow\downarrow\rangle), \tag{4-55}$$

$$|x_2\rangle = \sqrt{p_2}\,|\psi_2\rangle\,, \qquad |\psi_2\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle + |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle), \tag{4-56}$$

$$|x_3\rangle = -i\sqrt{p_3}\,|\psi_3\rangle\,, \qquad |\psi_3\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle - |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle), \tag{4-57}$$

$$|x_4\rangle = \sqrt{p_4}\,|\psi_4\rangle\,, \qquad |\psi_4\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle - |\downarrow\downarrow\rangle). \tag{4-58}$$

5 Conclusion

We have obtained Lewenstein-Sanpera decomposition for a generic two qubit density matrix by using Wootters's basis. It is shown that the average concurrence of the decomposition is equal to the concurrence of the state. It is also shown that all entanglement content of the state is concentrated in the Wootters's state $|x_1\rangle$ associated with the largest eigenvalue λ_1. It is shown that a given density matrix ρ with corresponding set of positive numbers λ_i and Wootters's basis can transforms under $SO(4,c)$ into a generic 2×2 matrix with the same set of positive numbers but with new Wootters's basis. We have also shown that the local unitary transformations correspond to $SO(4,r)$ transformations, hence, ρ can be represented as coset space $SO(4,c)/SO(4,r)$ together with positive numbers λ_i.

Appendix

Let us consider the set of linearly independent vectors $\{|\phi_i\rangle\}$, then one can define their dual vectors $\{\left|\hat{\phi}_i\right\rangle\}$ such that the following relation

$$\left\langle \hat{\phi}_i \mid \phi_j \right\rangle = \delta_{ij} \tag{5-59}$$

hold. It is straightforward to show that the $\{|\phi_i\rangle\}$ and their dual $\{\left|\hat{\phi}_i\right\rangle\}$ posses the following completeness relation

$$\sum_i |\hat{\phi}_i\,\rangle\langle\,\phi_i| = I, \qquad \sum_i |\phi_i\,\rangle\langle\,\hat{\phi}_i| = I. \tag{5-60}$$

Consider an invertible operator M which is expanded in terms of states $|\phi_i\rangle$ as

$$M = \sum_i a_{ij}\,|\phi_i\rangle\,\langle\phi_j| \tag{5-61}$$

Then the inverse of M denoted by M^{-1} can be expanded in terms of dual bases as

$$M^{-1} = \sum_i b_{ij}|\hat{\phi}_i\,\rangle\langle\,\hat{\phi}_j| \tag{5-62}$$

where $b_{ij} = (A^{-1})_{ij}$ and $A_{ij} = a_{ij}$.

References

[1] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky and Rosen, *Phys. Rev.* **47**, *777 (1935).*

[2] E. SchrÖdinger, *Naturwissenschaften.* **23** *807 (1935).*

[3] C. H. Bennett, and S. J. Wiesner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, *2881 (1992).*

[4] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. jozsa, A Peres and W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, *1895 (1993).*

[5] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, J. A. Smolin and W.K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, *3824 (1996).*

[6] A. Peres, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77** *1413 (1996).*

[7] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki and R. Horodecki, *Phys. Lett. A* **223** *1 (1996).*

[8] V. Vedral, M. B. Plenio, M. A. Rippin and P. L. Knight, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, *2275 (1995).*

[9] V. Vedral and M. B. Plenio, *Phys. Rev. A* **57**, *1619 (1998).*

[10] W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80** *2245 (1998).*

[11] M. Lewenstein and A. Sanpera, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80,** *2261 (1998).*

[12] B.-G Englert and N. Metwally, *J. Mod. Opt.* **47,** *2221 (2000).*

[13] S. Karnas and M. Lewenstein, *eprint quant-ph/0011066. (2000)*

[14] T. Wellens and M. Kus, *Phys. Rev. A* **64** *052302 (2001).*

[15] S. J. Akhtarshenas and M. A. Jafarizadeh, *eprint quant-ph/0207161 (2002).*

[16] R. Gilmore, *Lie Groups, Lie Algebras, and Some of Their Applications* (John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1974)